



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/976,322	11/21/1997	KIMMO DJUPSJOBACKA	915-312	1733

4955 7590 01/02/2003

WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS &  
ADOLPHSON, LLP  
BRADFORD GREEN BUILDING 5  
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224  
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER

BROWN, RUEBEN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2611

DATE MAILED: 01/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/976,322

Applicant(s)

DJUPSJOBACKA ET AL.

Examiner

Brown M. Reuben

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 2-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 2-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Prosecution Application***

1. The request filed on 10/15/2002 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 08/976,322 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2611

4. Claims 2-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terasawa, (U.S. Pat # 6,147,714) and Admitter Prior Art, page 6, lines 1-10, in view of Eyer, (U.S. Pat # 5,982,445).

Considering claims 2 & 19, the amended claimed method for addressing at least one service in a data communication system including at least one data transmission network for transmitting information in at least one data transmission stream, such that one or more service providers transmits services to one or more data transmission networks, wherein the services are assigned service ID data is met by Terasawa, (col. 8, lines 40-50), which discusses a service ID that is provided as a label for a particular service within a transport stream.

The amended claimed service ID identifying an original transmission network, reads on the disclosed original network ID (original\_network\_id(2)), see col. 8, lines 32-33. Also Terasawa more generally discloses a parameter, the Service Provider Item, discussed in Terasawa, (Fig. 13). The Service Provider identifies the provider, i.e. the original network that provides the particular service, col. 7, lines 58-62.

The claimed service ID identifying a transmission stream from the service provider reads on Terasawa, (col. 8, lines 28-34), which discusses the transport stream ID. Terasawa (col. 8, lines 40-50) meets the claimed service ID identifying the service within the stream.

As for the amended claimed feature of the textual worldwide globally individual name of services, Terasawa teaches that identification data uniquely identifies the services within the network, using the DVB definitions, but does not explicitly discuss a worldwide identification algorithm (Fig. 4; Fig. 8; col. 7, lines 59-62). However Admitted Prior Art, page 6, lines 1-10 discloses that it is advantageous to represent the DVB definitions within the format of a URL. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Terasawa to use worldwide identification algorithm, as disclosed by Admitted Prior Art, page 6, lines 1-10, at least for the desirable benefit of uniquely identifying services across a worldwide network.

However, Terasawa & Admitted Prior Art, page 6, lines 1-10 utilizes a numerical identification format, instead of the claimed non-numeric textual worldwide global identification method. Nevertheless, Eyer discloses the benefits of using the well-known HTML format of a URL address for identifying additional TV programming services, see col. 3, lines 17-15 & col. 4, lines 40-50.

In particular, Eyer teaches the advantages of expanding the generic hypertext markup language, for instance such as a HTVP, which enables unique functions of a set top system that may be controlled using the Internet, being identified according to a URL, (col. 11, lines 35-67 & 12, lines 1-40), which reads on the claimed non-numerical worldwide global identification. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the combination Terasawa & Admitted Prior Art, page 6, lines 1-10 to use a textual

Art Unit: 2611

worldwide identification algorithm, as disclosed by Eyer at least for the known benefit of a more user friendly technique, since consumers are more familiar with a textual identification format.

Considering claim 2, the claimed method for addressing at least one service among plural services or for addressing at least *one service component*, recites method steps that correspond with subject matter rejected above in the analysis of claim 2, and is likewise analyzed.

Considering claims 3 & 16, Terasawa utilizes DVB technology, col. 4, lines 62-67 & col. 7, lines 55-57.

Considering claims 4-5 & 17-18, Terasawa discloses that the service name information is added to both a SDT table records and EIT table records, see col. 7, lines 55-67; col. 8, lines 1-67.

Considering claim 6, Terasawa discloses the use of the service\_name and service\_provider\_name fields, col. 8, lines 61-67.

Considering claims 10-11, the claimed data communication system comprising at least one data transmission network for transmitting information on services in at least one data transmission stream, recites features that correspond with subject matter rejected above in the analysis of claim 2, and is likewise analyzed.

Art Unit: 2611

Considering claims 12-13, the claimed broadcasting device for transmitting at least on service in a data communication system comprising at least one data transmission network for transmission of information in at least one data transmission stream, recites features that correspond with subject matter rejected above in the analysis of claim 2, and is likewise analyzed.

Considering claims 14-15, the claimed receiver for receiving at least one service in a data communication system comprising at least one data transmission network for transmission of information in at least one data transmission stream, recites features that correspond with subject matter rejected above in the analysis of claim 2, and is likewise analyzed.

Considering claims 7-8, Terasawa does not mention the use of DSM-CC technology. Official Notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, DSM-CC technology was well known as a standard set of protocols for managing functions and operations of at least MPEG-1 & MPEG-2 bitstreams. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Terasawa with the features of DSM-CC technology, at least for the known benefits of increased command and control from a server to a client.

Considering claim 9, Admitted Prior Art, page 6, lines 1-10 & Eyer discloses using URL technology.

Art Unit: 2611

Considering claim 20, the claimed recitation is met by the use of the Internet discussed in Eyer.

Considering claims 21 & 22, Terasawa discusses using MPEG transmission streams, col. 3, lines 65-67.

### *Conclusion*

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A) Schein Teaches accessing services from a CATV network using the Internet.

B) Stautner Hyperlinks EPG services with the Internet.

C) Connelly Hyperlinks EPG services with the Internet.



Art Unit: 2611

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 872-9314, (for formal communications intended for entry)

**Or:**

(703) 872-9314 (for informal or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

*Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,  
Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the  
examiner should be directed to Reuben M. Brown, whose telephone number is (703) 305-2399.  
The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's  
supervisor, Andrew I. Faile can be reached on (703) 305-4380. The fax phone numbers for the  
organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314 for regular  
communications and After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding  
should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Reuben M. Brown



ANDREW FAILE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600